

THE  
CHRISTIAN FREEMAN.

---

VOL. II.]

AUGUST, 1834.

[No. XXII.

---

THE SELFISH SYSTEM.

---

CAIN was the father of the selfish system of philosophy. He understood well its principles: he carried its theoretic views into practical operation. *Self* was the object of his unfeigned veneration—the idol of his heart; and, therefore, at the shrine of *self* he did not hesitate to sacrifice the life of a brother. Cain, it is true, was a philosopher of the old school; but his doctrines have not shared the fate of many of the venerable remains of antiquity,—they have not been exploded. In a dress somewhat new, and with a *train* perhaps not blood-stained, Cain's theory has often figured, and is still found to bear a part even in the philosophy of the NINETEENTH CENTURY!

We wonder why the graduates of the selfish school have been so slow to recognize their founder. Are they ashamed of him? Do they blush for the consequences of Cain's beautiful theory of morals? Surely “a fellow feeling” should make them “wondrous kind;” and they should cherish the memory of their great ancestor, unless, as in some other cases, they dishonestly intend to strip him of the glory of original discovery, and adorn themselves with a plumage not their own. Let them not hope to escape with the perpetration of an act so atrocious and unprincipled. They forget the honour due to departed worth: they do not allow themselves to reflect that Cain was a man of distinction in his day, for “Jehovah set a mark upon Cain;” and that, therefore, it is their glory to be the followers of so noted a leader.

For our own part, we have no sympathy with the selfish system. Cain's theory of morality we denounce as abominable and iniquitous; ruinous to the individual, and destructive of the rights of the community. Is *self*, then, to be hunted from the abodes of men? Is *self* to be driven from the world? The question is easily answered. If *self* presume to usurp the throne of moral dominion we would hurl him from that holy eminence—we would crucify him; but if *self*, laying aside all such unsupported pretensions, take rank among the

subordinate principles of action, we have no accusation to bring against him: he is no longer *self*, in the sense in which he appears in the philosophy of Cain and his followers.

That selfishness exists, and that it is extensively prevalent, we do not mean to deny. We have yet, however, to learn that the mere prevalence of a principle is a guarantee of its rectitude. Were all men to become liars, would the universality of falsehood operate as a charm in transforming it into truth? or, should we feel prepared to elevate falsehood to the dignity of a first principle, and constitute it the leading characteristic of a new theory of morality? It has been maintained that selfishness is the all-absorbing motive of human action, and that it must be regarded as not only the main spring, but the sole spring of the machinery of our moral constitution. The world has been challenged to adduce a single instance of disinterested benevolence; and, when such instance has been adduced, as has been done repeatedly and triumphantly, not only are all the tests, supposed to be furnished by the science of mental chemistry, applied for the purpose of detecting the existence of selfishness; but, when these fail, the inveterate Cainite manfully asserts its existence, though the assertion is unsupported by his own partial experiments. On the same principle, we might challenge the world to produce a single instance of real selfishness; and by submitting pretended instances to a rigid analysis, we fancy we could discover in each some lurking particle of benevolence; or, failing in this, we could make up the deficiency by determined, unflinching, and uncompromising assertion. We cannot, therefore, admit the universal prevalence of selfishness; and even on the ground of such admission, we would deny its virtue. The selfish principle is no more justifiable than the selfish act: and a world of Cains could not stifle the loud vengeance cry of the blood of Abel.

The difference between what is, and what ought to be, is palpable enough; and yet many, whom we are accustomed to call philosophers, do not seem to be aware of it. We attach all due importance to the philosophy of fact; for we love to become acquainted with "things as they are;" but, scanning the conduct, and motives, and feelings of mankind, we can by no means say of them in the aggregate,—"whatever is, is right." Let the man of science minutely analyse, and faithfully distinguish. In the capacity of a moral anatomist, let him lay bare the selfishness of our nature in its most perfect developement; but let him not hazard the opinion that such a state of the moral constitution is a healthy and not a diseased state. Selfish-

ness, wherever it exists, is unnatural ; and no number of cases can establish the opposite conclusion. If selfishness were universal, it would be simply an *epidemic* ; and its universality, instead of changing or subduing the malignity of its character, or lessening apprehension, would justly create deeper alarm in every thinking mind.

Having ascertained that the existence of selfishness, under any variety of circumstances, affords no proof that selfishness is right, we proceed to generalize this conclusion, by stating that it is not the simple *fact* of any principle influencing conduct, but the *quality* of that principle that goes to determine its moral character. Did all men physically labour under some disease, surely it would not be the duty of the natural philosopher to regard that disease as part of the original human constitution. There might be difficulty, perhaps, in distinguishing it, but let philosophy grapple with the difficulty ; and if she cannot obtain the solution of it from reasoning on facts and observations connected with internal evidence, let her apply to some external source for the necessary information. The disease, by the supposition, really exists. Every pains must, therefore, be taken to distinguish it as a defect, or by whatever name it may be designated, from the original workmanship ; otherwise injustice is done to the Creator—his power, wisdom, and goodness are brought under suspicion. The same observation will hold in regard to moral man. Man, we know, was at first constituted an upright being. But is he so at present ? If he be perfectly upright, and his moral constitution fair and fresh as it proceeded from the hands of his Creator, then we do God no wrong in contemplating man, with all his feelings, and views, and motives, as a noble edifice,—a holy temple reared by the Deity. But if such representation is incorrect ; and if man is, in point of fact, a depraved being, let us beware of considering the derangement and ruin of our moral nature to be the work of God. This were a false and injurious imputation : this were to ascribe to a God of holiness what a God of holiness abhors : this were the most effectual way of robbing him of his glory, by making him the author of sin. This point, however, we may discuss more fully in another article. We close, for the present, our observations with an interesting extract from the lectures of Doctor Thomas Brown :—

“ The fallacy of this (selfish) system,” says that eminent philosopher, “ arises chiefly from the pleasure which truly attends our virtuous affections ; but which, though universally attending them, it seems to require no great nicety of dis-

crimination to distinguish as their consequence, not their cause. We have pleasure, indeed, in conferring a kindness ; but it is because we confer the kindness, and have had the previous desire of conferring it, that we feel this pleasure of being kind ; not because we feel this pleasure, that we confer the kindness ; and if we had never been beneficent, we should as little have known the delight of beneficence, as we should have known what external beauty is, without the previous perception of the forms and colours of the objects which we term beautiful.

\* \* \* \* \* In acting virtuously we do what it is pleasant to do ; but it is not on account of the pleasure that we perform the action, which it is delightful for us to do, and almost as delightful to us to have done. Indeed, to destroy our pleasure altogether, nothing more would be necessary, than to impress us with the belief, that the actions were performed by us with no other view than to the selfish gratification which we might feel in thinking of them ; and with a total carelessness as to the happiness of those to whose welfare the world conceived us to be making a generous sacrifice. If conformity to selfish gain were all which constitutes virtue, why should our pleasure in this case cease ? It ceases for the best of all reasons, that it arises from virtue, and can arise only from virtue ; and that, in such a case, as there would be no longer any virtue, there would, therefore, be no longer any thing to be contemplated with satisfaction. Such is that gross and revolting system, which would represent all the seeming moral excellences of the world,—every generous exertion, every magnanimous forbearance,—as one universal deceit,—one constant unwearied search of personal good, in which not a single wish ever wanders beyond the personal enjoyment of the individual.\*

D

### SOME ACCOUNT OF THE ANCIENT FAMILY OF DONOTHING.

*To the Editors of the Christian Freeman.*

GENTLEMEN,—You have some time since devoted a chapter to “Idle Christians.” You have said nothing, however, I am sorry to say, of another very respectable and ancient family,—the family of “Donothing.” The family of Donothing is very ancient indeed; tracing its genealogical line away far beyond fat monks and lean pillar saints, and not even

acknowledging, as the first of the race, that eminent ancient Donothing who said to his father, "I go, Sir; but went not." Were it not very ungenteel to speak the truth to so ancient and respectable a family, I would hint that their first ancestor was the old gentleman who said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" At any rate, there is as little fear of their claiming extraction from Tubal Cain, as there is of their being seized by any pressgang; for the softness of their hands will be sufficient evidence that they are artificers neither in brass, iron, nor any other thing.

There are many branches of the Donothing family; but my business at present is specially with the gentlemen and ladies of the family. By some means or other, with which I at present have no concern, they have become, if not all very rich, at least independent. They abound among those classes of nominal Christians who profess to have got free from the trammels of mystery, and to have embraced that "rational Christianity" which permits them to enjoy a philosophical and dignified ease. Indeed, a chief reason inducing so many of the Donothing family to embrace "rational Christianity" is, that this sort of Christianity lets them slip through without putting them to inconvenience or trouble. The Donothings don't like praying, especially family and closet praying, and "rational Christianity" is not very pressing on this point; the Donothings consider church discipline very impertinent and annoying, and "rational Christianity" dispenses with it; the Donothings consider psalm singing and, above all things, long preaching, especially preaching to the conscience, a very great bore, and "rational Christianity" is, on these points very accommodating and genteel. Then, again, "rational Christianity" teaches them that missions to the heathen, and active zealous exertions to make converts to truth and holiness, are mere fanaticism; and they are thus saved from the troubles and hard work of their simpleton neighbours. The remarkable fact of their case is simply this,—that, while they profess to expect salvation by works, they work none at all; while those who expect to be saved by faith, work as though they believed that works could save them. It is a well-known truth that the Donothings do not care a straw for "rational Christianity," more than for orthodoxy; and the only thing which attaches them to it is, that it hushes conscience, and lets them alone.

There are, however, orthodox as well as heterodox Donothings; and with the orthodox my chief concern is now.

Perhaps they won't acknowledge any family connexion with the heterodox Donothings, for they profess very great antipathy to heterodoxy. There is no use, however, of their denying their kindred; for the matter can be settled at once by applying a test left by One who knew them all well,—“By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Very likely, too, they may be ready to deny that Donothing is really their name. It has become fashionable, I know, in these reforming times, for people, by inserting or adding some ridiculous double *s* or double *e*, to endeavour to cheat the world out of the plain English of their names. Such sort of genteel trickery won't do, however, in the present case. Donothing is the real old English name, and that it is most appropriate I propose now to show. The mere circumstance of the orthodox part of the Donothing family making a religious profession, and some of them a high religious profession, is no difficulty in my way; for I respectfully decline considering the making of a mere profession as doing any thing;—nay, should I be provoked, I have no fear of being able to prove that the making of a mere empty profession is worse than doing nothing;—it is, to say the very least, doing nothing to purpose; or, if it be insisted that it must be considered as doing *something*, I grant it to be sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind.

“Yes: but,” say some of my neighbours the Donothings, “We do more than make a profession—we give good advices from the pulpit, and the platform, and in our private sphere; and what is more, we give money for many benevolent and strictly religious purposes.” Give! I don't deny that you give, but recollect, neighbours, that I am not talking at present about giving, but about doing. Even good advices are very cheap, and easily given, too, when not accompanied by good example; and giving money, and giving personal exertion, are two very different matters. Heaven would have been full long since, if money could have paid men's way into it; and many a tombstone would have recorded, like that near Cork, that he who lies under it had left Heaven in his debt. Paying money would be a very easy plan, indeed, of getting into heaven; and where is the man having faith in such a plan, who, however he may have cheated Heaven during life, would not, on his deathbed, bequeath a good round sum for the good of his soul? Whatever else may be done by proxy, one thing is sure, that the soul cannot be saved by proxy. Each man is accountable for himself to God; and for himself, as though there were not another in all the world, he must one

day answer. The children of this world are here wiser in their generation than the children of light. The Devil keeps no curate; and all over whom he rules, compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, they make him two-fold more the child of hell than themselves. God's rule is very plain, and very clear. "He hath told thee, O man! what is good," not to get other people to work thee into heaven, or pray thee into heaven. "He hath told thee (thy own individual self) O man! (whether poor or rich) what is good;" and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with thy Maker?

The family of Donothing, however, don't believe a word of all this; for if they did, could they possibly remain Donothings still? A considerable number of the family of the Donothings have of late years become dissenting preachers. In old puritanic times they kept close to the Establishment, for there was not much made then by laziness any where else; but since the Bounty, and snug matches, and good farms, and other fat things of that sort, have enabled dissenting ministers to earn the parson's honours without loss of sweat, the Donothings don't seem to trouble themselves much about the question of union between church and state.

Some of the reverend Donothings preach at times rather decentish sermons, and they visit and catechize too; and have, I am sorry to say, in some cases large and it may be admiring congregations: yet, after all, they are Donothings still. Their hearts are not in Christ's work—their eyes are not turned to the object and end of the work—they sow, but they shall never reap; they work for no harvest, they pray for none, and they shall never have it. They may have electrified the crowd by their popular talents—they may have opened the flood-gates for rivers of tears; but no fruits meet for repentance follow. Christ is ashamed of them now; he will disown them at last: everlasting shame shall cover them. Let no false tongue say over their graves, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."

Donothings are oftentimes very good at a speech,—not merely good pulpit men, but good platform men too. One of the best speechmakers I know is a Donothing thorough-bred. In fact you may hear all kinds of fine speeches from Donothings: some most warm—absolutely red-hot, some very sublime, and some very solemn and seemingly holy; though I

must acknowledge that a large number of them are very prosy. There is a wide difference between a good platform man and a good committee man; though a very great number of the Donothing family have been nominated on committees. Indeed I know whole committees composed entirely of the Donothing family, both male and female; for, as I said before, the Donothings were always respectable, and therefore very likely to be put on committees, as it is frequently in proportion to a man's noise or his purse, that he stands a chance of being put even on religious committees. Some people take the liberty of saying that the committee of the Belfast Seaman's Friend Society is composed chiefly of the family of Donothings, at least that if they do any thing, they take special care not to let their left hand know what their right hand doeth. Such people, however, have no business to begin to grumble yet a while; for if they wait half a dozen years longer, they will find that the committee of the Seaman's Friend Society have been proceeding with all proper caution, and using all prudent deliberation.

Even when appointed on committees, the Donothings take good care to maintain their consistency. Their most common plan to escape duty is to absent themselves; this, however, is vulgar. If they can obtain any honourable sinecure post that will keep them above drudgery, well; if not, they know another trick, which is simply to watch their opportunity when any piece of hard work is to be done, and move that Mr. Such-a-one and Mr. Such-an-other,—one an honest hard-working fellow, the other perhaps a vain shallow fellow,—shall be appointed to execute it. All the Donothings, of which there is a goodly number in almost every committee, catch the proposal in an instant; every one is glad that the burden has not fallen on his shoulders; the motion is put, and passed *nem. con.*; and thus old Greybeard Donothing, and all the younger branches, preserve their honour and their name untarnished.

Some may express surprise that any of the family of the Donothings would put himself to the trouble of walking up the stairs of a pulpit, even when he sees the door wide open to receive him. Such surprise, however, is founded on sheer ignorance: young Donothing has often nothing to do with the business. His father and mother pay some people and coax others to push him on from behind; and young Donothing just goes as fast and as far as he is pushed, and neither faster nor farther. An ecclesiastical court, after various examinations

and exercises, get the young “candidate for the ministry,” as he is called, tied to them with a string called a “code;” and as a talented minister of such a court lately said, “when once fastened, like a monkey’s young upon her back, there is no such thing as shaking him off.” Old Donothing and his wife resolve to make one of their sons a preacher; and a preacher he shall be.

Let it not be supposed, for a moment, that the respectable family of the Donothings are all in holy orders. By no means. Some ministers imagine that the Donothings make very good elders, deacons, and churchwardens, on account of there being little trouble with them; but I cannot agree to this doctrine. As to churchwardens, I am not so positive; for it would be rather troublesome to have a churchwarden who would act on the determination expressed by the London Quaker, when about to be appointed to the office of churchwarden,—to fine, according to law, every single individual not attending each Lord’s Day on his parish church; but as to elders and deacons, I feel confident that one of the greatest blessings a minister could enjoy, is the co-operation and advice of a number of right-hearted men in such offices; and if he and they are indeed right-hearted men, instead of giving each other annoyance, they will establish and strengthen each other in every good word and work. The great majority of the respectable orthodox Donothings are laymen; a fair proportion of whom are useful for giving a respectability of appearance to a congregation at public worship, occupying, perhaps, the double pews, or raised corner pews, or even handing round the plates at a public collection. When I have added to this, that they themselves lay a fair proportion on the collecting plate, and that they contribute their quota for general expenses, I have given the Donothing family the full meed of praise which they deserve.

Yet what is this in comparison with what is required of a man and a Christian? How very far, indeed, behind the two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets!—“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”

Every Donothing has much spare time; but it is not given to God. The huts of starvation and misery are full around him; but he pays them no visits of mercy: the ignorant are perishing for lack of knowledge; but he takes no pains to instruct them: the profligate are rushing on to eternal ruin; but

he uses no effort to stop them : a boundless sphere of usefulness is spread everywhere around him ; but, so far is he is concerned, it may remain a wilderness for ever.

Messrs. Editors, while sinecures are vanishing from the political world, let them also be banished from the religious. The Donothings have been in place too long. Their spirit is not the spirit of the religion of Jesus : their character is far from being that which adorns the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. The religion of Jesus is ardent, active, and self-denying : its author went about continually doing good. Where Christianity is, there is spirit, and there is life. Indifference and spiritual death are the forerunners of hell. Where there is no activity there is no life. Can idleness cultivate Christian graces ? Can self-indulgence prepare for fellowship with him who became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Christian ministers, have you had young souls born to you in the Lord ? Beware lest you suffer their first love to dissipate in inactivity. As you would keep young souls safe, for which you must one day answer, furnish them with useful employment ; engage them immediately in their master's work ; teach them to feel at home and happy in their Redeemer's service ; appoint them to Bible classes ; allot to them some sphere of active benevolence : as you value their souls, I repeat again and again, do not suffer them to be idle. Fathers and mothers, I say the same to you. I am a plain blunt man, who speaks out what he thinks ; but dont let anything I have said quaintly or foolishly, prejudice you against what I say to you now with my heart's whole sincerity. Do not suffer your children to imagine, that they have one moment which they can afford to lose. They must, it is true, have times of recreation and refreshment ; but these, too, can be, and ought to be, dedicated to the service of God and of their brethren. Is there more real enjoyment in talking nonsense than sense ? None but a fool would say there is. May not pastime, in its highest enjoyment, be not merely innocent, but improving ? and why should we not look back with as much satisfaction to the hours of our recreation as of our labour ? The human body requires rest ; the human mind requires only change of employment. That employment may vary in ten thousand different ways, yet still be pleasing to God, having his glory as its object. Oh ! how my soul detests the gross, selfish life, which many, called Christians, lead ; if that can be called life which is a mere vegetable parsnip existence—sunk deep in earth ; its whole grovelling self deep down in clay. God grant

that I may wear out, rather than rust out; and when he pleases to take me away, may it be as he took my father before me, with mental energy unbroken, and in the midst of activity.

I am, your's,

DAVID DOLITTLE.

---

## THE POWER OF TEMPTATION.

---

IT will be readily conceded by all, on viewing the subject abstractedly, that there is in man a liability to yield to the power of temptation. Whether any supposed individual may have been actually overcome or not, still the liability is inherent; and it is not impossible but that circumstances may occur, of such a nature as to induce him to deviate from the path of rectitude. It is true this liability exists in gradations innumerable. Some are noted for yielding to the most trifling temptation that may be presented,—the shadow of an inducement is sufficient to lead them aside from what is right: while others are no less eminent for unbending virtue and fixed integrity. Still, however, it will be allowed by general consent, that there is, in all, a liability to be overcome by temptation.

The subject changes its aspect when we endeavour to ascertain what triumphs temptation has actually achieved. Not without reluctance, will any confess that their resolution has been destroyed, and that they have been vanquished and led captive by this powerful foe. And still more reluctant will they be, to entertain the supposition that, in time to come, some particular temptation may strip them of their moral fortitude, and painfully demonstrate their boasted strength to be but weakness. Inform Peter that, ere the cock crow, he will deny his Master, and he treats the information as a piece of absurdity. Before the temptation is presented, his soul within him recoils at the very idea of such base ingratitude. He feels, or thinks he feels, giant strength in his moral resolution; and, in consequence, he makes the most solemn asseverations that, though he should die with the Saviour, he will not deny him. Let Hazaël learn the atrocious crimes which temptation will assuredly lead him to perpetrate, and witness his surprise. Treating the message as an utter delusion, in a state of feeling that could not be easily delineated, he asks the prophet, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" These, however, are not exceptions to the general principle, which the consent of mankind has abundantly established. They do not go to prove

that the world will deny that man is liable to fall before the power of temptation. From what sources, then, does this liability proceed?

I. It proceeds, in many instances, from weakness. Man is liable to be overcome by temptation, because he is deficient in moral resolution. The man who has been reduced to extreme bodily weakness, whose tottering limbs with difficulty support an emaciated frame, is easily driven hither and thither by every wind that blows. Unable to resist the slightest impulse, he is compelled to make an irregular and circuitous course, the most trivial obstacle interrupting his direct progress. Let such an individual be exposed to view, and his appearance will immediately convince all that his natural strength is not adequate to surmount any difficulty which he may have to encounter. The resistance which he could overcome must be, indeed, feeble. How easy would it be to turn him to the right hand or to the left, or to stop his motion altogether. Now such a picture affords an illustration of the circumstances connected with moral debility. The man who is destitute of firmness of purpose, however clearly he may perceive a certain course, and however deeply his understanding may be convinced that he ought to pursue it, will yet allow trivial pretexts to interfere with his convictions. The enticement which, to the man of resolution, would appear in its native insignificance, presents itself to his mind, clothed with vast importance. The object which the former would treat with merited contempt, seems to the latter to deserve some attention; and whilst he tampers with it, and bestows on it that attention, his moral strength is gradually giving way,—the temptation is gaining on him, till, in the event, it triumphs over his want of determination. Does such a man engage in God's service? His irresolution is not instantaneously destroyed; and as long as a particle of it remains, he is liable to be overcome by temptation. Weakness, therefore, wherever it exists, is one part of the *materiel* on which temptation successfully operates.

II. Liability to be overcome by temptation often arises from a predisposition to do that, for which the temptation seems to afford a favourable opportunity. What avails the strength of a nation, if a large proportion of that strength is devoted to the subversion of its own interests? Look to the past state of the world, to the civil commotions which have agitated kingdoms, and shaken empires to their centre. Look to some powerful nation, which has courageously withstood the shock of formidable assailants—unmoved, like the rock of the ocean,

amid breaking waves and howling tempests. The people are generous and valiant. They have united with cordiality and love in the advancement of their common interests. They have gone hand in hand to face the invading foe. Long has that nation triumphed over every opposition: long has it borne away victory from the battle-field: long has it bid a proud defiance to every attempt at reducing its power and diminishing its glory. But discord has appeared among its rulers: the fire of dissension has spread over its extensive territories: it has seized on the breasts of the people: the flames of civil war have burst forth, carrying ruin and devastation in their progress. The surrounding nations glut their eyes with the spectacle. They are delighted to find that this powerful nation is itself doing the work which *they* had vainly laboured to accomplish. When, therefore, it has manifested a sufficient predisposition to its own ruin, they find it no difficult matter to inflict the fatal wound. This nation, then, has proved that no foreign power could destroy it; and it has also proved, with equal clearness, that it could destroy itself. The citadel may be defended when all within is union and determination; but when there is *treachery* within the walls,—when some are secretly in the interest of the enemy,—there is danger—there is impending destruction. And is not the human heart placed in similar circumstances in regard to temptation? If there be no ally in the bosom, no secret traitor to holiness in the affections, when temptation makes her grand attack on the heart, she finds herself utterly enervated and powerless; she finds that *there*, there is nothing but opposition to meet; and that, so long as the heart is thus defended, it is impregnable. It was thus that temptation was foiled in her attacks on the blessed Saviour. There was no traitor in the bosom of Jesus, no lurking inclination towards a sinful compliance; and, therefore, though he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet he did no sin, neither was guile found in his lips. But who, like the Saviour, can say with truth, “the tempter cometh, and hath nothing in me?” Surely, then, the existence in our bosoms of a predisposition to comply with temptation, subjects us to a fearful risk of being overcome by its ensnaring influence.

III. Our liability to be overcome by temptation, may be traced to the numerous and varied forms in which it is presented. A man be fortified against the attacks of an open enemy. His energy and activity may paralyse the arm which has been raised for his destruction; yet he may fall by the dagger of the midnight assassin. A man may be able to expose false reasoning

—to rend in pieces the gossamer web of sophistry—to rebut the most powerful arguments that can be advanced against the religion which he espouses; but the blandishments of flattery—the soft smooth tongue of persuasion—may prevail upon him to renounce or violate the principles of his faith. How varied the forms of temptation! The man of cool deliberate intrepidity, whose attachment to his religion and to his God would laugh at the terrors of persecution, is induced, by the influence of persuasion, to do violence to his conscience; or is overcome by some diabolical scheme, noncompliance with the conditions of which would involve the liberties or perhaps the lives of his dearest friends. On the other hand, a few well-timed threatenings will readily terrify from rectitude him whose resolution is at best weak—whose moral strength is debility.

Temptation may be rejected in many of its varieties; and, notwithstanding, may ultimately prevail, by assuming an attitude which commends it to the particular views or feelings of him on whose heart its magic power is exercised. The tempter requires perseverance and ingenuity; and they are both at command. All temptations may be traced, in the comprehensive phraseology of Scripture, to the devil, the world, and the flesh; but these borrow a thousand different disguises, called by a thousand different names. How fearfully, then, is the liability to yield multiplied! The path of integrity along which we move is rugged, and difficult of ascent. Temptation steps forward, and very kindly points us to another path, lying very near the path of integrity, and so smooth, and so strewed with flowers, and so shaded with trees, that we fancy there can be no harm in going a little aside. The fatal resolution is taken, and all is lost. Ah! with what firmness should the first allurements of temptation be resisted. In such circumstances, the danger of moving a single step is incalculable. It will, in all probability, tell on the character and destiny throughout eternity. The way pointed out by temptation may seem to run parallel to the way of uprightness, and to be at no great distance from it; but ere long it will awfully diverge. Look to their several terminations. The one conducts to the light of life's eternal day;—the other, to the blackness of darkness for ever.

Are we then liable, awfully liable, to enter into temptation in some of the countless and ever varying forms in which it presents itself? and does it not become a question of the last moment, what are the means appointed by the Saviour for neutralizing the force of temptation, and giving us the victory? To this point we may perhaps advert in another paper. D.

## THE TRINITY.—No. II.

WE propose to exhibit Scripture evidence, first, of plurality in the Godhead; and, secondly, that this plurality is *triune*.

I. The Scriptures declare the existence of plurality in deity.

1. Plural names indicate a plurality in Godhead. God reveals himself by names. The names of God are expressive of what he really is. The nature of God is peculiar—infinitely beyond the approximation of the highest creature, and known fully only to Deity himself. When he reveals himself by names, he reveals, therefore, the reality and peculiarities of his nature: when he reveals himself by names in the singular form, he declares the unity of deity, to the exclusion of all pretended deities: when he reveals himself by appellations in the plural form, he declares that plurality of subsistence is included in the nature of Godhead. The first verse in the Bible is an example. Our English translation fails to preserve the plural form of the divine appellation, but the inspired Hebrew presents it—"In the beginning ELOHIM (*Gods*) created the heaven and the earth." To maintain the doctrine of Jehovah's unity, while asserting his plurality of subsistence; the verb, in the original (*Bara*) is in the singular, while the nominative, Elohim, is plural. This plural appellation in construction with verbs in the singular, is given to God in innumerable passages in the Hebrew Scriptures. That this plural name is not an arbitrary or chance peculiarity of Hebrew is evident, because, the singular form, Eloah, is employed in other passages. In addition to finding the plural name joined to a verb in the singular, what is still more remarkable, we find the verb in the plural, when the name is in the singular form. And that there was a design in this interchangeable use of nominatives in the plural, and verbs in the singular, and nominatives in the singular, and verbs in the plural, is evident from the frequent use of Elohim, in construction with verbs and adjectives, both plural and singular.

What renders the ascription of plural appellations to God still more striking, is the frequent coupling of the name in the plural with another name in the singular. Even in those very passages in which he asserts his unity in opposition to false gods, he reveals himself by a plural appellation. When issuing precepts against idolatry, he does not scruple to speak plurally of himself; using, at the same time, the appellation Jehovah, which is always singular: thus declaring a plurality

respecting deity in one sense, and in another sense asserting unity. That memorable passage, for example, Deut. vi. 4, reads thus, according to the original—"Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Elohim (Gods) is one Jehovah." In Isaiah xlvi. 18, he declares that he is Jehovah, and that there is none else: and while he declares himself the Jehovah who created the earth, he declares himself at the same time, Elohim (Gods) who formed the earth; and yet, in the twenty-second verse, the singular form of the name is retained,—"I am (El) God, and there is none else." The preface to the ten commandments is, "I am Jehovah Elohim (Gods) which brought thee out of the land of Egypt:" and in the second commandment, after prohibiting idolatry, he thus says in annexing the reason—"I, Jehovah Elohim (Gods) am a jealous God." To render this still more striking, Jehovah is said to be the *Elohim* (Gods), and the *Elohim* are said to be *Jehovah*. Thus, in Psalm c. 3—"Know ye, that *Jehovah*, he the *ELOHIM* (*Gods*) he hath made us." And again, in the passage before adduced—"Jehovah, our *ELOHIM* (*Gods*) is one Jehovah."

Adonim (lords) is another plural appellation given to the Most High. Mal. i. 6. If I be (adonim) lords, or masters, where is my fear? A variety of other plural appellations are ascribed to him. Remember thy Creator (Heb. *Creators*) in the days of thy youth. Eccl. xii. 1. Thy Maker is thy husband (Heb. *thy Makers is thy husbands*); Jehovah of Hosts is his name. Is. liv. 5. "The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy (Heb. *Holy Ones*) is understanding. In Daniel iv. 17, we read of the decree of the *Watchers* and the word of the *Holy Ones*; and yet, in the twenty-third, we read only of a *Watcher* and an *Holy One*. From a deliberate consideration of the whole of the passage, we are persuaded that plurality and unity are both affirmed in reference to deity. On a review of the plural appellations by which God speaks of himself, in a revelation one express design of which is to extirpate polytheism and idolatry, it will appear evident that this singular and amazing fact can be accounted for on no other principle than that of a distinction in Godhead which we employ the term person to denote; and that the revelation of plurality in deity, in connexion with unity, is the revelation of a peculiarity really subsisting in the nature of Jehovah.

2. The name Jehovah is applied in several scriptures in such a way as necessarily to indicate a distinction of persons. Jehovah is the incommunicable name of God,—a name which

no created being can hold in common with God; because Jehovah only is self-existent, and the author of existence to all other beings. Now this name, Jehovah, while it has no plural form, is applied to more than one person. For example: it is said, Gen. xix 24—"Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven." We have here the visible Jehovah who *appeared* to Abraham and talked with him, raining the fiery vengeance from the invisible Jehovah, respecting whom our Lord declares, "no man hath seen God at any time." Jehovah is here expressly applied to two persons, and yet, it is elsewhere said, "Jehovah, our ELOHIM, is *one* Jehovah." We have another example in Hosea i. 7—"I (*Jehovah*) will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by *Jehovah* their God." Here Jehovah is applied to a distinction of persons in deity. Now, connect with this, those declarations in the New Testament, in which God the Father is denominated, "God our Saviour," and those in which he is said to *save* us by his *Son*, who is also called God; for "he sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world;" and again, other declarations in which he is said to *save* us by the *Holy Ghost*, for "he hath saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost."—Titus iii. 4-6. We have here most clearly a plurality, and a three-fold plurality. Jehovah's declaration of saving Judah "*by* Jehovah, their God," furnishes an easy solution to difficulties respecting agency, as if involving inferiority of nature, that may be raised from such Scriptures as state, that God made the worlds *by* his Son, Heb. i. 2; and that God, *by* his Spirit, garnished the heavens, and created the successive generations of the animal tribes, Job xxvi. 13. Psalm civ. 30. The agency ascribed to the Son and to the Spirit in these passages, implies no inferiority of nature. Each was Jehovah; Father, Son, and Spirit, are the one Jehovah Elohim: and theirs is a grand copartnership of combined and co-operative agency on the part of Jehovah Elohim—Father, Son, and Spirit—in the formation, conservation, and government of all things, and in the salvation of the church.

3. There is a third class of Scriptures in which God distinctly declares the existence of plurality in deity.

Gen. i. 26, 27.—"And God (Elohim, Gods) said. Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness. So God created man in *his* own image; in the image of God created *he* him." In this passage, God, in announcing his purpose when proceeding to the formation of man, speaks in the language of

plurality ; but in narrating the account of the formation of man, he employs the style of unity. Some tell us that the meaning of this passage is, that God took council with angels, and invited them to participate with him in man's creation. To ascribe creation to a created being, is to ascribe to him an impossibility. A creature creating, is a manifest contradiction : creation is the peculiar prerogative of Jehovah. Jehovah asserts creation to be his work, to the entire exclusion of every creature. " Thus saith Jehovah, thy Redeemer, and *he that formed thee from the womb*, I am Jehovah that maketh all things ; that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*, that spreadeth abroad the earth *by myself*." To say that he took council with angels, in relation to the formation of man, is a gratuitous and gross assumption,—an assumption flatly contradicted by a text of Scripture—" Who hath directed the *Spirit* of the Lord, or, being his counsellor, hath taught Him ? With whom *took HE counsel*, and who instructed Him ?"—Is. xl. 18. Others say, that the expression, " Let us make man," was a form of speech copied by Moses from the style of royalty employed by an earthly monarch, who is accustomed, in his public documents, to speak of himself plurally—*we* and *us*, as a mark of dignity. We are able to dispose of this artificial gloss in the most triumphant manner. Moses is, indeed, the inspired historian of the creation ; but God, and not Moses, uttered the language, " Let us make man." We explode, at once, the fictitious comment, that God spoke after the bombastic style of an earthly monarch, by simply asking what earthly king was there to speak of himself in the false and inflated terms of *we* and *us*, before the creation of man ? There is no evidence that any earthly king spoke of himself in this style before the time of Moses, or long after. Earthly monarchs probably borrowed this manner of speaking of themselves from this very form of language in which God has revealed himself, and it is certain that they have impiously and blasphemously arrogated many of the titles and appellations of the Most High. When God speaks of himself as one, and yet as more than one ;—when he employs the plural form, Let *us* make man, and similar modes of expression, unlike the vain, earthly worm, who, in the pride of his heart, impiously apes the style and titles of deity ; *He* speaks truly of himself—He speaks of himself as he really is.

In another passage we read, " And the Lord God (Jehovah Elohim, Gods) said, Behold, the man is become as one of *us*." Here, again, the twisters and torturers of Holy Writ tell us, that

God was speaking to angels, and that the *us* includes angels. But we would ask you, O most wise, are angels the fellows of Jehovah? The language is clearly expressive of plurality.

Isaiah vi. 8 is too remarkable to be omitted. "I heard the voice of Jehovah, saying, Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us*?" In these words Jehovah speaks of himself both in the singular and plural forms,—intimating the subsistence of a plurality of persons in one supreme and adorable Deity. That the fact of a plurality of persons is essentially involved in this declaration, is evident from the identification made by the New Testament of the speaker here, Jehovah of Hosts, with the Son, and with the Spirit. All admit that the Father speaks; but John says of the whole vision of the prophet, that it was Christ's glory which he saw: "These things said Esaias when he saw his (Christ's) glory, and spake of him." The Apostle Paul, in Acts xxviii. 25, determines that there was also the presence of the Holy Ghost: "Well spake the *Holy Ghost* by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive." We have John's testimony that the Son is included; we have Paul's testimony that the Spirit is included; we have Isaiah's testimony that the speaker was "Jehovah of Hosts." The moral demonstration, therefore, is irresistible. Jehovah, in his address to Isaiah, "Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us*," speaking thus at the same time in the plural and in the singular respecting himself, uses this style in harmony with the fact that there is a plurality of persons—three divine subsistences in the Godhead. This conclusion will appear attended with still more light to the mind, when we take into consideration other circumstances connected with Isaiah's vision. The scene of the vision was the Holy of Holies; that is, the holy place of the Holy Ones. The adoration of the seraphim was a thrice repeated ascription of Holy: "*Holy, Holy, Holy*," they cried, "is Jehovah of Hosts." This act of trine adoration is immediately followed up by a voice from the excellent and overwhelming glory, uttering proclamation in the language at once of unity and plurality: "Also, I heard the voice of Jehovah saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Now let us group the whole of these considerations together;—the place—the holy place of the Holy Ones—the repetition of the adoration *three* times, Holy, Holy, Holy—the *One* Jehovah of Hosts to whom it was addressed—the language of *plurality* employed by this *One* Jehovah—the inspired declaration of

John that, on that occasion, Isaiah saw the Glory of Christ, and the inspired declaration of Paul, that the Holy Ghost was a speaker on that occasion. What is the obvious and irresistible conclusion? The obvious and irresistible conclusion is, that there are three persons in the essential unity of the Godhead.

4. A large class of Old Testament Scriptures represent the Son of God as the angel of Jehovah; and, therefore, a distinct person: and yet declare him to be Jehovah; and, therefore, a divine person. Angel is a name, not of nature, but of office. It literally signifies a messenger, a missionary, one who is commissioned, delegated, or sent by another. That the word angel is expressive, not of nature but of office, is evident from the consideration that the term is given to a minister of the Gospel, as well as to an inhabitant of heaven. Hence, we read of the angel of the Church of Ephesus, the angel of the Church of Sardis, and such like. The Son of God is called the Angel of Jehovah, because in his mediatorial capacity, according to the arrangement between the Father and the Son in the eternal Covenant of Grace, he was the missioned or sent of the Father to be the Saviour of the world. The Old Testament economy was conducted by the Son, who, as the guide of Israel through the desert, was the Jehovah, the "acting God" of the ancient dispensation; but who, at the same time, appeared as the Father's messenger, and was, therefore, fitly denominated the Angel of Jehovah.

We read in the 16th chapter of Genesis of the interview between the Angel of Jehovah and Hagar. The Angel of Jehovah found her by a fountain in the wilderness, and said unto her, "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly." That same Angel of Jehovah is, in the 13th verse, denominated Jehovah (Lord) and God: "And she called the name of the Lord (Jehovah) that spake unto her, Thou, God, seest me." This calls forcibly to our mind the adoring address of Thomas to our Lord after his resurrection, on being persuaded that it was indeed he: "My Lord and my God." Here is distinctness, then, affirmed with regard to the Son, and yet sameness and equality.

Jehovah appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. Abraham saw three angels in human form. One of these is called Jehovah. Two of them depart, but he who is called Jehovah remains. This glorious personage, in the conversation which follows, demands, "Is there any thing too hard for the Lord?" and is called by Abraham the "Judge of all the

earth :” and the account of the interview is thus closed, “ And the Lord, Jehovah, went on his way as soon as he had left communing with Abraham.” Gen. xviii.

God tried Abraham, and directed him to offer up his son in sacrifice. Gen. xxii. Abraham had taken his journey, built the altar, bound Isaac, and had stretched forth his hand, and taken the knife to slay his son. The Angel of the Lord calls to him out of heaven, bids him desist, and says, “ Now know I that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from *me*.” God ordered Abraham to offer up Isaac in sacrifice : sacrifice cannot, without horrible idolatry, be offered up to any but God ; but this Angel of Jehovah declares that Abraham had not withheld his only son from him ; therefore, we conclude this angel was a divine person, the Son of God, who “ was with God, and was God.” John i. 1. This conclusion is still more confirmed by what follows. “ The Angel of Jehovah called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By *myself* have I sworn, saith Jehovah, because thou hast done this thing, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thee.” Now the angel swears by himself. To swear by himself is the prerogative of God ; and to fulfil the promise is the work of God : the whole passage, accordingly, is applied by the Apostle Paul. Heb. vi. 13.—“ When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by *himself*, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.”

God appeared to Jacob at Bethel : “ And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, then shall Jehovah be my God.” Gen. xxviii. 21. Jacob afterwards relates the following vision to Rachael and Leah :—Gen. xxxi. 11–13, —“ And the Angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying, I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow unto *me*.” Here the Angel of God is declared to be the God who proclaimed himself to Jacob at Bethel as Jehovah, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, —the God whom Jacob worshipped by the religious rite of vowed. This Angel was none other than Christ, who is declared to be “ over all, God blessed for ever.” Rom. ix. 5.

The Angel of Jehovah, in human form, wrestled with Jacob. That same Angel is declared by Hosea, speaking of that astonishing transaction, to be the object of prayer—to be God—Jehovah God of Hosts. “ By his strength he had power with *God*, yea, he had power with the *Angel*, and pre-

vailed ; he wept and made supplication unto *him* ; he found *him* in Bethel, and there he spake with us : even Jehovah, God of hosts ; Jehovah is his memorial.”—Hos. xii. 4, 5. This, doubtless, was the Son of God, who, being the essential “image of the invisible of God,” was, in all these wonderful appearances, the representative image of the Father ; a manifestation of God ; the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person ;—“Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God.”—Phil. ii. 6.

This was the same Angel invoked by Jacob on his death-bed. Gen. xlvi. 15—“He blessed Joseph and said, *God* before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the *God* which fed me all my life long unto this day, the *Angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” Here the Angel is identified with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob : this Angel was the God who fed Jacob all his life ; this Angel redeems ; this Angel blesses ; this Angel is prayed to ; and what Angel can this be but the Angel of the Covenant—the Saviour—the Redeemer—our Lord Jesus Christ ?

The same Angel was the Jehovah Angel who appeared to Moses in a flame of fire, out of the bush—Exod. iii. 2-6. He is expressly called the Angel of the Lord, and that Angel expressly proclaims himself God. “God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.” He proclaims himself the *I AM*—the Jehovah Elohim of Israel. Now let us fix it in our minds, that he who proclaims himself the *I am that I am* ; the God who said in the bush, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob ; was the very same with the Angel of Jehovah—that Angel for whose good will to Israel, Moses blessed and prayed the Lord, as “the good will of him that dwelt in the bush.”—Deut. xxxiii. 16.

The same uncreated Angel was the guardian and guide of Israel through the wilderness to Canaan. The Father makes this promise to Moses. Exod. xxiii. 20,—“Behold I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice : provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions ; for my name is in him.” Who is this ? Surely no created Angel, but the uncreated Angel of the Covenant. He is the only Angel who has power to pardon sin,

He is the only Angel who is the object of supreme reverence and obedience. He is the only Angel in whom is the name *I am*, Jehovah, the incommunicable name of God. He it is who is called the *Angel of Jehovah's presence*, and whose office it is to *save*.—Is. lxiii. 9. He it is whose office is to go before his people as their shepherd and captain,—to keep them that are committed to him, and to bring them to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. This angel of his presence, was that *presence* promised by Jehovah, *My presence shall go with thee*. On one occasion God threatened to punish the Israelites for their rebellion, by not going with them to Canaan himself, but to commit them to “an angel,” not *the Angel of his presence*, but a created angel. At this the people mourned, and Moses interceded with God, and said, “If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence.” Moses prevailed with the Lord to repeal his threat, and obtained a renewal of the promise,—*My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest*. Moses and the Israelites were overwhelmed with distress at the idea of being committed to a created angel; but being guided by the Angel of his presence, of whom God said, “My name is in him,” they considered the same as being guided by God himself. The Son of God is the *presence* of God. “I and my Father,” said he, “are one.”

This Angel was the Jehovah who went before the Israelites in a pillar of cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night, and gave the law out of the midst of thunderings and lightnings on mount Sinai; for Stephen declares that “Moses was in the church in the wilderness with the Angel which spake to him in the mount Sina.” Acts vii. 38. Now this Angel was Christ. Our Lord says, “No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” All the appearances of Jehovah in patriarchal and Israelitish times, were appearances of the Son as the image of the invisible God. The Angel of God's presence, the Messenger of the Covenant, is the same who was God manifest in the flesh, who died for our sins, was received up into glory, who is head over all things to the church, and who will finally raise the dead and judge the world. That it was Christ who was with the Israelites in the wilderness is evident, because the New Testament declares that it was Christ whom the Israelites tempted in the desert. 1 Cor. x. 9,—“Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.” CEPHAS.

## REVIEW.

1. *Authentic Report of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy, between the Rev. JOHN SCOTT PORTER, and the Rev. DANIEL BAGOT, M. A. On April 13th, and three following days, in Belfast. Pp. 204, 8vo. Second Edition.*
2. *Review of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy, by ALEXANDER CARSON, A. M. Pp. 58, 8vo.*

IN our last number we alluded to certain reasons which induced us to postpone, for one month, our review of the "Authentic Report of the Unitarian Discussion." Several of our readers have expressed disappointment at the delay; and they expect from us, reasonably enough, a justification of our conduct. We refuse not to stand at their bar, and admit their authority to decide. We must, however, plead guilty to the charge of having made an unconditional promise, which editors, and many others, should endeavour to avoid. But we will not waste our own time, or that of our readers, with useless preliminaries. We postponed our review chiefly that we might have the opportunity of noticing, in connexion with the Report itself, an admirable pamphlet on it, from the pen of the Rev. ALEXANDER CARSON, one of the first biblical critics of the age. This pamphlet has our warmest recommendation. We shall take occasion in the sequel to make quotations from it; but we say to every reader, "Procure the pamphlet itself, if you would possess a triumphant exposure of some of the main fallacies of Unitarian criticism and interpretation."

The Authentic Report, it will be observed, has already reached a second edition, though the first contained no less than **THREE THOUSAND** copies. The public mind is still alive to the importance of the subject, and we rejoice that it is so. We have said, and we say again, that "we anticipate much good to the cause of Orthodoxy," from the extensive circulation of the Report. The great body of Scripture testimony advanced by Mr. Bago<sup>t</sup> remains untouched. From the Report itself, and particularly from Mr. Carson's Review, it will be seen, that many of the strongest passages Mr. Porter has not even attempted to answer. We admit Mr. Porter's scholarship;—indeed he has taken special care in the course of the discussion to remind us of it. We admit that, as a critic and a theologian, he stands at the head of his party; and, there-

fore, we feel that the failure of the cause in *his* hands is the more signal.

The use which Mr. Porter has made of certain authorities, both Unitarian and Orthodox, calls for animadversion. It is fashionable, in the present day, for Arians and Socinians to overlook their distinctive peculiarities, and to amalgamate their mutually destructive systems into one discordant whole, which they designate Unitarianism. Now, we regret that Mr. Porter should have even *seemed* to give countenance to this ridiculous and monstrous abortion. We did not, of course, expect him, in the discussion with Mr. Bagot, to turn his arms directly against Socinianism; but as little were we prepared to find him eulogizing the disciples of the low Humanitarian school. The inconsistency did not escape the notice of Mr. Bagot, who very properly furnished a specimen of the religious sentiments entertained by Priestley and Belsham, two of Mr. Porter's venerated authorities. If Arians *will* keep Socinian company, it is quite necessary to inform the religious public what Socinian company is. Mr. Porter professes to "bow to the testimony of divine revelation with entire reverence." He spurns the charge which has been often preferred against Unitarians of undervaluing or despising the sacred volume, and appeals to LARDNER and PRIESTLEY, whom he ranks among the most distinguished defenders of revelation. When the reference to Priestley met our eye, we were half inclined to ask, is Mr. Porter serious? or does he mean to make himself merry at Dr. Priestley's expense? Did Priestley believe in divine revelation? We hesitate not to answer, *he did not*, if by divine revelation we are to understand the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Opposing the Arian view, in regard to the subordinate agency of Christ in the material creation, Priestley says, "Now as it is not pretended that there are any miracles adapted to prove that Christ made and supports the world, I do not see that *we are under any obligation to believe it, merely because it was an opinion held by an Apostle.*" Again he says, "It is not certainly from a few casual expressions, which so easily admit of other interpretations, *and especially in epistolary writings, which are seldom composed with so much care as books intended for the use of posterity*, that we can be authorized to infer that such was the serious opinion of the Apostles. But *if it had been their real opinion, it would not follow that it was true, unless the teaching of it should appear to be included in their general com-*

*mission.*”\* Here is one of Mr. Porter’s defenders of the sacred volume. We should like to know *how much of it* Priestley believed to be the word of God. He has plainly degraded from that rank **ALL THE EPISTLES** at least. Did he treat the Scriptures of the Old Testament in whole or in part with greater respect? We leave it to his admirers to answer the question. Priestley’s Bible, we suspect, was rather a portable little book,—a thing which might be circulated by a Unitarian *Tract* Society without the slightest inconsistency. With these plain statements we leave our readers to pronounce on Mr. Porter’s conduct in coupling the name of Priestley with the defence of revelation, while these gentlemen are utterly at variance about what revelation is: Mr. Porter believing it to be the “word of God contained† in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are received into the authorised version, admitting them all to be canonical;” and Priestley indicating distinctly enough that what he recognized as revelation might be comprised in a two-penny pamphlet. Well might the pious churchman exclaim, “from such defenders of Christianity, good Lord, deliver us!”

Let us now look at Mr. Belsham, another Unitarian, with whom Mr. Porter seems prepared to symbolize. “The Scriptures,” says Belsham, “contain† a faithful and credible account of *Christian doctrine*, which is the *true word of God*; but they are not *themselves* the word of God, nor do they ever assume that title,” &c. Such is the opinion of Mr. Belsham—an opinion more injurious to the Bible, than is the utter and bold rejection of that book by the infidel.

Mr. Porter seems to be fond of authorities. During the discussion, he paraded a goodly array from the ranks of the orthodox. We willingly concede to him the right of turning to the best account the admissions and arguments of Trinitarian writers. Let him seize every statement of theirs that can be supposed to favour his cause; for his cause needs all available resources. But let him beware of misrepresentation. We

\* Wardlaw’s Lectures, page 8.

† We take for granted that Mr. Porter is above the despicable trickery chargeable on Unitarians in the use of the word *contain*. We believe the Scriptures *to be*, not merely to *contain*, the word of God. The latter phrase may be employed, uncandidly we grant, by one who rejects the whole Bible as uninspired, with the exception of a single verse or clause. Hence the necessity of distinct statement.

charge him not with wilfully misrepresenting the sentiments of Schleusner, and Stuart, and Wardlaw, and Carlile; but we do maintain that he has given an unfair statement of the views of these writers, and we will prove it. In page 116 of the Authentic Report, where he adduces "the meanings of the term *Λογος*, as given by the celebrated Trinitarian lexicographer Schleusner in his Lexicon of the New Testament," one of which meanings is *a teacher*, we find Mr. Porter making the following remark,—"N.B. To this meaning Schleusner refers John i. 1, John i. 14, and 1 John v. 7." Now this, to an unlearned reader, has all the effect of a misrepresentation. Let us take Schleusner's own statement: To this meaning, *perhaps*, are to be referred the above-cited passages, which *can* conveniently *be* interpreted of Christ, the highest and the unequalled (*unicus*) teacher of the human race, without prejudice, however, to the sentiments of those who prefer using the phrase, *the substantial, hypostatic, and eternal Word*. Surely it would be more creditable to Mr. Porter to have given a fairer and fuller account of Schleusner's views. It will not be easy for even his friends to believe that candour dictated the course which, in this instance, he has adopted.

At page 168, Mr. Porter, in reference to 1 Tim. iii. 16, asserts that the reading, "*God was manifest in the flesh*," is rejected as spurious by Dr. Wardlaw. We meet this assertion with a flat contradiction. The above reading Dr. Wardlaw does not reject as spurious. In a note at page 48 of his "*Lectures on the Socinian Controversy*," he introduces the following general caution.—"I wish it to be understood, as one of my objects, by declining to build on any texts which are thus disputed, not to express my decided opinion respecting their genuineness, but to show that our cause does not depend upon them,—that our evidence is abundant and clear, even on the supposition of the spuriousness of every one of them." On the authority of this testimony alone, we should feel warranted to contradict Mr. Porter's statement. But we proceed further. Dr. Wardlaw has actually made certain "remarks," calculated to support the reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16, which appears in the authorised version. He does not, indeed, use it as a proof of the divinity of Christ, and he has assigned the reason, "because," says he, "I was desirous of having it to say, that I had built no part of my argument on any passage which eminent critics had pronounced of doubtful."—*Notes to his Lectures*, page 496. To assert, therefore, as Mr. Porter has done, that Dr. Wardlaw rejects the common reading of this text as spu-

rious, is to assert what is contrary to matter of fact. If Mr. Porter knew Dr. Wardlaw's sentiments, he has misrepresented them; if he was unacquainted with them, he should have said nothing on the subject.

We find Mr. Porter enrolling the name of Mr. Carlile, also, on the list of Trinitarian writers who have rejected 1 Tim. iii. 16 as spurious. In this case, we do not charge him with an unfounded statement; but we charge him with want of discrimination. He asserts absolutely and unqualifiedly the rejection of the authorised version as spurious, "by Mr. Carlile of Dublin." Now the assertion in this form, to say the least of it, is very inaccurate. What is Mr. Carlile's language in reference to the passage?—"In the present state," he observes, "of the evidence, the word *who* (ὅς) is pointed out as the genuine reading." This is the only length Mr. Carlile feels himself at liberty to go. He speaks of the passage in relation to his opinion of "the present state of the evidence;" but he had too much good sense, and too nice critical discrimination, to pronounce the common reading absolutely and unqualifiedly spurious. We may add that Mr. Carlile believes the passage, according to his reading of it, to contain a decided proof of the Deity of Christ. "I hold," says he, "that this passage also, understood according to the obvious import of the words, gives the title God to the Lord Jesus Christ."

Another Trinitarian writer whom Mr. Porter has not fairly represented is Professor Moses Stuart of Andover. According to Mr. Porter, Professor Stuart considers the common reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16 as "so extremely *doubtful* and *uncertain* that no *argument can be built on it*." To this version of the matter we object, as defective in fairness and impartiality. But we shall, as in other instances, allow every reader to form his own judgment by furnishing Professor Stuart's opinion as stated by himself. In his able letters in defence of the Trinity and Divinity of Christ he says, "I pass over several passages where our common text applies the name of God to Christ; e. g. Acts xx. 28 and 1 Tim. iii. 16. In regard to this latter text, however, it appears to me a plain case, that *the authorities, which GRIESBACH himself has adduced, would fairly lead to a decision different from his own*, respecting the genuineness of the reading Θεος," God. Here are Professor Stuart's own words, and, unquestionably, they prove Mr. Porter's statement to be a misrepresentation. Instead of believing the common reading to be "extremely doubtful and uncertain," he is of opinion that Griesbach's rejection of the reading in ques-

tion is not supported by his own authorities. It is true, Professor Stuart does not find any argument on the text, because, like Dr. Wardlaw, he felt no desire nor necessity to press into his service, "witnesses of a character *at all* dubious." But surely the most prejudiced mind must, at once, discover the wide discrepancy between Professor Stuart's view of this text, as given by himself, and the same view, as represented by Mr. Porter.

The mention of the name of Griesbach suggests the propriety of making an observation in regard to his merit, as the editor of a critical edition of the Greek Testament. We respect his labours, and we feel that he has laid the theological world under weighty obligations; but we refuse to recognize his New Testament as a standard. Did we feel inclined to prefer charges against him in his editorial capacity, we would begin with his citation on John i. 1, of the noted various reading of Samuel Crellius, the Socinian,—a reading which is purely conjectural—which is supported by no authority, and which, therefore, ought to have been beneath the notice of Griesbach. Professor Stuart's opinion of him and of his writings is worthy of being known. He expresses his conviction that Griesbach was a man who would not designedly misrepresent facts or arguments for or against any reading; "but," continues the Professor, "the work which he undertook was too great to be accomplished by one person, or even by one whole generation of critics. Dr. Lawrence, in his essay upon the classification of Manuscripts by Griesbach, has rendered it more than probable, that Griesbach's account of facts is not unfrequently *very erroneous* (not through design, but from human infirmity); and that the principles by which he estimated the value of manuscripts, and, of course, the genuineness of particular readings, are *fundamentally erroneous*."

We pass from the subject of *authorities*, leaving with our readers Griesbach's noble testimony to the Deity of Christ, as it appeared in his first edition of the New Testament, "So numerous and clear," observes that learned critic, "are the arguments and testimonies of Scripture in favour of the true Deity of Christ, that I can hardly imagine how, upon the admission of the divine authority of Scripture, and with a regard to fair rules of interpretation, this doctrine can by any man be called into doubt. Especially the passage contained in the first three verses of the first chapter of John, is so clear and so superior to all exception, that by no daring efforts of either commentators or critics, can it ever be overturned, or be

snatched out of the hands of the defenders of the truth."—*Smith's Scripture Testimony*, vol. ii. page 540.

There are still two or three points of a general nature which we feel ourselves called to notice.

Mr. Bagot had stated, in his first proposition, that "there is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged Godhead of every creature." Commenting on this statement, Mr. Porter asks, with most amusing astonishment, "Where, where in all the world did Mr. Bagot light upon this heterodox truth? Not certainly in the creeds which he habitually recites in public worship, and which, whether Nicene or Athanasian, contain no doctrine so pure, so clear, so beautiful, so scriptural, so divine, respecting the Godhead of the Almighty." We ask, is this to be taken as a specimen of ignorance or of misrepresentation on the part of Mr. Porter? Does he mean to tell the religious public that the creeds of the orthodox, including that of the church established by law, do not assert distinctly the unity of God? We call on Mr. Porter to name any orthodox church which rejects the doctrine of the divine unity. We call on him to specify the published creed of any church among the orthodox, from which Mr. Bagot could not extract the simple, and beautiful, and sublime truth contained in his first proposition. We call on him to do this, or to retract the implied slander which he has cast upon the Trinitarians as a body. There is not an orthodox creed in the world, which does not contain the doctrine in question. It is common among writers of a certain class to take for granted that we are tritheists: the imputation is false, glaringly false; it merits contempt, not indignation. If Mr. Porter can prove that the doctrine of the Trinity involves a contradiction, or that it is inconsistent with that of the divine Unity, let him furnish his proof, and the controversy is at an end. But let him not substitute insinuation and assertion for reasoning.

Mr. Porter has not yet done with Mr. Bagot's first proposition. The following is a further specimen of his *sayings* on the subject. "I say again,—I distinctly say that Mr. Bagot, by this statement, shrinks from the defence of the Trinity. I say again that he renders up the battlements of his own ecclesiastical creed. I say again that he has not given a clear, an open, and an explicit answer, in accordance with the principles which he is supposed to maintain, to the very question which he perseveringly and pertinaciously urged on me!" On these powerful sayings Mr. Carson well observes, "Why then, if Mr. Porter says this again, and again, and again, and again,

there can be no demonstration in Euclid more thoroughly proved. What does Mr. Bagot want more? 'Were he to go to Rome, I am sure he would not get so much.' Mr. Carson might have furnished, from one of his former publications, a parallel to Mr. Porter's *sayings*, in the anecdote respecting the old Scottish minister. 'They say,' said the minister, 'that I have departed from the standard, but I say that *they* might as well say that I am standing on my head.'

We have often wondered at the absurd principles tacitly assumed by Unitarians in estimating the force of Scripture testimony. One of these principles Mr. Porter has assumed, when speaking (page 10) of the evidence for the Deity of Christ. This doctrine, he expressly asserts, cannot be true, unless it be supported by testimonies not only more explicit in kind, but also *more numerous in quantity*, than those usually adduced out of the evangelical records!! The last clause involves another false principle. Why confine the statement to "the evangelical records"? We must have the whole Bible. But why does Mr. Porter insist on testimonies *more numerous in quantity*, as an essential pre-requisite to belief in any doctrine? We hold that if this doctrine, or any other, is stated once, he is bound to receive it. Nay he must either receive it or set aside the authority of God. "Testimonies *more numerous in quantity*" indeed! When God announces a doctrine for the first time, will Mr. Porter call him a liar, and will he refuse assent to the doctrine till God shall have repeated his statement a sufficient number of times? We admit that it is very satisfactory to have various Scripture testimonies in support and elucidation of a doctrine; but we do maintain that the authority of one is as binding as that of a million. On this false principle Mr. Porter founded a proposal to Mr. Bagot, to go through with an examination of all the passages in any one of the evangelists, bearing on the subject of the Deity of the Logos, anticipating, of course, that the result would be favourable to Unitarianism. In the event of this proposal being acceded to, "I venture to affirm," said he, "that Mr. Bagot will not have adduced three hints or allusions to the doctrine of the supreme Deity and perfect manhood of Christ as united in one person, until I shall have quoted three hundred direct proofs to the contrary." Strange that the gentleman who made this flourish should have subsequently complained of the multitude of Mr. Bagot's Scripture proofs.

It is, however, with the absurdity of such a mode of proceeding that we are mainly concerned. Mr. Porter has de-

clared his belief, with some abatement, in the pre-existence of Christ. Were the Socinian to challenge him to bring this doctrine to the test by which he has invited Mr. Bagot to try the doctrine of our Lord's divinity, Arianism might well tremble. It is true, indeed, Mr. Porter could adduce the declaration of Christ in support of the doctrine of pre-existence, but what is one declaration to the multitudinous testimonies insisted on by the Socinian? Mr. Bagot characterized this principle well, when he denounced it as employing on Scripture, "the Algebraic process of positive and negative quantities." Why does Mr. Porter assume the incompatibility of perfect deity, and perfect manhood in the person of the Logos? We cannot answer; but this we know, that, instead of his boasted THREE HUNDRED passages, he has not been able to advance one Scripture testimony in opposition to the doctrine. "The word was God," and "the word became flesh," are witnesses to the divinity and humanity of Christ: their testimony is decisive; they have never prevaricated; they have ever testified to the truth. The Unitarian has never proved the evidence of either to be false; but in default of proof, he has often enough taken it for granted.

We had intended, in this place, to introduce some remarks on Mr. Porter's treatment of the doctrine of the Greek article, and to quote some beautiful criticisms of Mr. Carson in reference to the application of the doctrine. But from the state of our pages, we find that these remarks must be reserved for another paper.

For the two leading propositions put forward respectively by Mr. Bagot and Mr. Porter, our readers are referred to the number of the Christian Freeman for May. The first proposition of each disputant contains an assertion of the divine unity; thus far they are nominally agreed. Mr. Porter's second proposition impugns, and Mr. Bagot's asserts the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. Before proceeding with an analysis of the general arguments based on the fundamental propositions, we shall show our readers the relative strength of the two champions in their first serious encounter. To prove that the "FATHER" alone is God, to the entire exclusion of all other beings, Mr. Porter quoted, among other passages, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6, \* \* \* There is none other God but one; for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), yet to us *there is but one God THE FATHER*, of whom are all things, and we in him, &c. To this argument Mr. Bagot

made the following able reply, which we insert without abridgment.

The next quotation was from 1 Cor. viii. 4—6; “As concerning, therefore, the eating of those things which are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one: for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many); but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.”—Upon this passage, I beg to make the following remarks:

(1.) The God of the Christian is here placed in direct and expressed contrast, not to a plurality *in* his own nature, but to a plurality of false gods, whom the heathen worshipped.

(2.) The “one God,” in ver. 6, is not placed in opposition to the Godship of Christ, who is elsewhere frequently styled God (as in Rom. ix. 5), any more than the expression “one Lord,” is placed in opposition to the Lordship of the Father, who is elsewhere frequently styled Lord (as in Mark xii. 29). The Father and the Son are “one God,” as the Son and the Father are “one Lord;” or else there are *two Lords and two Gods*.

(3.) It is asserted of both the “one God,” and the “one Lord,” in this passage, that they are equally the Creator and Preserver of all things: of the former it is said, “of whom are all things, and we in him;” and, of the latter, “by whom are all things, and we by him.”

(4.) As the Apostle speaks of the objects of idolatrous worship, under the *general* designation of “those that are called gods,” and then subdivides them into two *species*, of “gods many, and lords many;” it is evident that the “lords many” are, equally with the “gods many,” included in the more general designation of those that are “called gods.” But there is a perfect parallelism between the fifth and sixth verses, from which I infer that the “one Lord Jesus Christ” is, equally with the “one God the Father,” included in the more general declaration at the commencement of the 6th verse: “But to us there is but one God.”

(5.) The last remark is based upon the supposition that the “one God the Father” refers to the Father *personally* (or the first person of the Trinity); but I am rather disposed to think, that the word “Father” is used in this passage in a more extended sense, as a general designation of the Divine Being, in the sense of Creator and Preserver of all things. And this I argue, from the *explanation* of the term which is immediately added, “the Father, *of whom are all things*.” In this view, therefore, of the passage, the “one God, the Father, of whom are all things,” includes Christ in his divine nature, by whom all things were created, and by whom all things consist; and the “one Lord Jesus Christ,” in that case, involves a reference to him in another capacity, as Mediator, and Head over all things to his church.

(6.) Those who deny the Deity of Christ, and argue for the Deity of the Father *only*, are bound to account for the Apostle’s *contrasting* the Lord Jesus Christ with the *false Deities* of the Heathen; for why do so, unless he possessed *true Deity*? On their principles, the

person contrasted with the gods many and lords many of the Heathen, should have been the Father *only*; for why mention another person, if the Father *only* possessed true Deity?

(7.) This passage is valuable to my cause, as giving a meaning to the term Κύριος, so frequently applied to Christ. The Apostle undoubtedly uses Κύριοι (in ver. 5) as a classification or species of Θεοί in the preceding part of the verse. Κύριος (in English, Lord) implies dominion or authority, and is given to Christ about a thousand times in the New Testament. Throughout the Septuagint it is used as the

translation of the Hebrew word יְהוָה (Jehovah). Κύριοι exactly corresponds with the Baalim of the Phoenicians. It is a word, however, which admits of great latitude in its application; but in this passage, as well as in others, we have plain evidence of its being applied to Christ in the highest sense, not merely from the reasons before stated, but also from the declaration, “by whom are all things,” being connected with it; for this phrase is used in Rom. xi. 36, and in Heb. ii. 10, to designate God as the *originating cause* of all things, as is evident from a reference to the original of the three passages, in all of which the same preposition, *dia*, occurs.

Mr. Porter's *reply*! to this is given at page 59, where, addressing the audience, he says, “I put it to you, as persons of intelligence and education,—as may be presumed from the station in life which you appear to occupy;—I put it to you, as persons whose presence here shows that you are in some degree concerned for the progress of religious truth;—I put it to you, as persons who frequent those places in which the word of God is dispensed, and who are in the habit of reading those works in which statements in support of peculiar doctrines are brought forward:—I put it to you all, if you ever heard of a specimen of sophistry so perfect, as that just afforded by Mr. Bagot's comment on 1 Cor. viii. 6. I never, in all my life, witnessed such *paring down* of Scripture; or such quibbling, in order to get rid of the plain meaning of a plain text.” If there is any reasoning in this, our ingenuity, we confess, is inadequate to the discovery of it. If Mr. Bagot has put forward “quibbles” and “sophisms,” why does not Mr. Porter expose them? He ought to be above the puerility of merely *calling names*. The honest Quaker acted a much more rational part, when, finding his powers baffled by some formidable argument which had been employed against him, he addressed it in these words: “The Lord rebuke thee, O argument, the Lord rebuke thee.” A man never *calls sophism to an argument* which he feels himself in capacity to answer.

MELANCTHON.

*To be continued.*

**MANCHESTER MISSIONARY MEETING.**

THE various religious public services connected with this society, commenced in Manchester, on Sunday, 15th June, and terminated on Wednesday evening.

The anniversary commenced with divine service at the several chapels in Grosvenor-street, Piccadilly, Mosley-street, Chapel-street, Salford, Rusholme-road, New Windsor, Gartside-street, Jackson's Lane, Hulme, Patricroft, and Pendleton. Sermons were delivered at each of those places by preachers of the highest intellectual attainments and Christian piety,—Dr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, the Rev. James Parsons of York, the Rev. R. Knill from St. Petersburgh, the Rev. T. Stratton of Hull, the Rev. J. J. Carruthers of Liverpool, and the Rev. J. Anderson, Wesleyan minister of Manchester. The discourses of these gentlemen comprised as able and glowing appeals to the Christian sympathies of their hearers, as ever were delivered in the town of Manchester, and it will be seen that their appeals were responded to with a liberality unexampled.

On Monday the services commenced with prayer meeting, in Grosvenor-street chapel, Piccadilly. At six in the evening, a public meeting of the members and friends of the society, was held in the same chapel. After prayer an abstract of the report of the Parent Society was read. It contained a large mass of valuable information relative to the missions to the islands of the South Sea, to China, the countries beyond the Ganges, the East Indies, South Africa, the British Colonies, and a number of other places in which the LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY have planted the standard of the cross. The meeting was addressed by the Rev. Mr. Knill, missionary at St. Petersburgh, in a most effective manner. The Rev. Dr. Wardlaw followed, and delivered an extremely interesting address, after which the Rev. Messrs. Stratton, Parsons, Carruthers, Anderson, and subsequently Mr. Knill, spoke with great power in favour of the claims of the heathen. A collection was made after the divine blessing had been implored, the meeting separated about ten o'clock.

The annual sermon in behalf of the Society was preached on the evening of Tuesday, in Mosley-street chapel, by the Rev. John Angel James, of Birmingham. The chapel was crowded to excess. He took for the subject of his discourse, the first and second verses of the 67th Psalm,—“God be merciful unto us, and bless us,” &c.

On Wednesday morning a breakfast was given in the spacious school-room, underneath the chapel, in Chapel-street, Salford, at which upwards of five hundred individuals were present. After breakfast the company adjourned to the chapel, and the meeting was addressed by the Rev. Mr. Knill, Dr. M'All, Mr. James, Dr. Wardlaw, Mr. Par-

sons, and others. The meeting occupied till near one o'clock, and from the subjoined statement it will be seen that most liberal collections were made.

The last and most solemn of the services of the anniversary, was the ordination of the Rev. Thomas Boaz, as a missionary to Calcutta. This service took place in Grosvenor-street chapel, Piccadilly, on Wednesday evening, at half-past five o'clock, in the presence of an immense congregation, and so great was the interest excited, that great numbers were unable to obtain admission. The service commenced with prayer and singing, after which the Rev. James Parsons delivered an appropriate address upon the manner in which the evidences of Christianity should be unfurled to minds in darkness and idolatry, the duty of Christian missionaries, and a variety of topics suitable to the peculiar solemnity of the occasion. Having concluded his discourse, Mr. Parsons proceeded to address Mr. Boaz, and requested him to state the time and manner of his conversion; when and how he first felt the motions of the Holy Spirit, prompting him to enter the service of God, as a missionary; and lastly, requiring him to state the general doctrines he held.—Mr. Boaz rose and complied. He entered first, with much feeling, upon the narrative of his conversion; and his account, being full of interest, was listened to with profound attention. He then described the manner in which he felt first impelled to enter the missionary field, and lastly, he entered into a lengthened exposition of his religious sentiments, and of the faith he entertained in the doctrines of the Word of God. This part of the service being concluded, Mr. Boaz knelt down whilst prayer was offered by the Rev. J. A. James, the ministers on the platform standing, and, at the proper period, each approached and laid hands upon him. The Rev. Dr. Wardlaw delivered the charge to the young missionary.

*The Collections.*

At Grosvenor-street chapel after sermons on Sunday	£500	0	0
At Mosley-street do. do.	500	0	0
At Rusholme-road do. do.	100	0	0
Chapel-street, Salford	200	0	0
Other chapels, the amount of which is not yet ascertained, about	100	0	0
Public Meeting on Monday	140	0	0
Anniversary sermon on Tuesday	160	0	0
At the breakfast on Wednesday morning	800	0	0
From various Juvenile Societies, about	250	0	0
	£2,750	0	0

The sums received at the breakfast on Wednesday morning, have already received considerable additions; and further contributions are expected, which will swell the total receipts to £3000.